



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ST

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/823,263  | 04/13/2004  | Paul P. Latta        | LATTA.002C4           | 3489             |
| 20995   | 7590        | 11/03/2005           | EXAMINER              |                  |
| KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP<br>2040 MAIN STREET<br>FOURTEENTH FLOOR<br>IRVINE, CA 92614 |             |                      | BELYAVSKYI, MICHAIL A |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 1644                  |                  |

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/823,263             | LATTA, PAUL P.      |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Michail A. Belyavskyi  | 1644                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1644

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/19/05 has been entered.

Claims 1-11, 13-14 are pending.

*Claims 1-11, 13-14 are under consideration in the instant application.*

In view of the amendment, filed 08/19/05 the following rejections remain:

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 and 6 –11,13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,703,017 or by US Patent 5,425764 or US Patent 5,629,194 each in view Posselt et al (Diabetes, 1992, v.41, pages 771-775) for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, mailed on 06/16/05

Applicant's arguments, filed 08/19/05 have been fully considered, but have not been found convincing.

Applicant asserts that Posselt et al., teaches away from using tolerizing dose of insulin producing cells anywhere but thymus and it only shows success in the absence of prior sensitization to the implant.

The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's interpretation of Posselt et al. The issue raised in the previous Office Action was that it is the Examiner position that Posselt et al., teach two step strategy: first administering a small dose of cells that induces an unresponsive state, i.e.

Art Unit: 1644

tolerizing dose and then administering fully therapeutic dose, at another site. Posselet et al., teach that said strategy permits the survival of pancreatic islet transplant. ( see entire document, Abstract and page365 in particular). The fact that Posselet et al., implanted the first, i.e. tolerizing dose into thymus does not neglect the teaching of the advantages of using the two step process i.e. implanting first a small number of cells in one place and then implanting a therapeutic dose in different place. Posselet et al., teach that the important goal in the treatment of insulin-dependent diabetes by pancreatic islet transplantation is the development of strategies that allow permanent survival of pancreatic islet without continuous host immunosuppression. There is no indication or suggestion in Posselt et al. that only intrathymic transplantation should be performed. Posselt et al., teach that the finding that recipient bearing established intrathymic graft fail to destroy subsequent extrathymic islets either by rejection or autoimmunity argues that additional mechanism that alter systemic immune response are also involved. In other words, one skilled in the art would immediately recognized that Posselet et al., teach an advantage of two step process in the treatment of insulin-dependent diabetes by pancreatic islet transplantation. However, it is noted that the instant claims does not recited any specific place where a first tolerizing dose of insulin-secreting cells should be implanting.

US Patent '017 teaches a method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising implanting insulin-producing cells encapsulated in a biologically compatible membrane ( see entire document, Abstract and columns 6, 8, 9 –14 and Example 12 in particular) . US Patent '017 teaches that insulin producing cells are pancreatic islet cells from primary cell source ( see columns 8 and 11 in particular). US Patent '017 teaches that pancreatic islet cells are from the same species as the mammal and are implanted interperitoneally into the tissue of a mammal beneath the kidney capsule ( see overlapping columns 13-14 and Example 2 in particular). US Patent '017 teaches that encapsulation of said insulin-producing cells in biologically compatible membrane for success of implantation is well known in the art ( see column 12 and Example 12 in particular).

US Patent '764 teaches a method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising implanting insulin-producing cells encapsulated in a biologically compatible membrane ( see entire document, Abstract and overlapping columns 5-6 in particular). US Patent '764 teaches that insulin producing cells are pancreatic islet cells ( see column 1 and 4 in particular). US Patent '764 teaches that cells are implanted interperitoneally ( see column 5 in particular).

US Patent '194 teaches a method of treating diabetes in mammal comprising implanting insulin-producing cells encapsulated in a biologically compatible membrane ( see entire document, Abstract overlapping columns 7-8 , 12 and Example II in particular). US Patent '764 teaches that insulin producing cells are pancreatic islet cells ( see column 8 in particular). US Patent '764 teaches that cells are implanted intaportal ( see column 7 in particular). US Patent '194 teaches administration of one or more anti-inflammatory agent at the dosage sufficient to achieve the desired therapeutic effect. US Patent '194 teaches that said agent can be administered prior to

Art Unit: 1644

at the same time or subsequent to administration of insulin-producing cells ( see overlapping columns 14-15 in particular).

US Patent '017 or US Patent ' 764 or US Patent '194 does not explicitly teaches a method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising administration two doses of insulin-secreting cells one tolerizing and one curative wherein tolerizing doze is one order less than curative.

As has been discussed supra, it is the Examiner position that Posselet et al., teach that the important goal in the treatment of insulin-dependent diabetes by pancreatic islet transplantation is the development of strategies that allow permanent survival of pancreatic islet without continuous host immunosuppression. Posselet et al., further teach a strategy comprising two step process : first administering a small dose of cells that induces an unresponsive state, i.e. tolerizing dose and then administering fully therapeutic dose, at another site ( see entire document, Abstract in particular). Posselet et al., teach that said strategy permits the survival of pancreatic islet transplant.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Posselt et al. to those of US Patent '017 or US Patent ' 764 or US Patent '194 to obtain a claimed method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising administration two doses of insulin-secreting cells one tolerizing and one curative wherein tolerizing doze is one order less than curative

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so, because a strategy comprising two step process : first administering a small dose of cells that induces an unresponsive state, i.e. tolerizing dose and then administering fully therapeutic dose, at another site permits the survival of pancreatic islet transplant as taught by Posselet et al. Said strategy can be used in the method of treating diabetes in a mammal, comprising implanting pancreatic islet, taught by US Patent '017 or US Patent ' 764 or US Patent '194. The strongest rationale for combining references is a recognition, expressly or impliedly in the prior art or drawn from a convincing line of reasoning based on established scientific principles or legal precedent, that some advantage or expected beneficial result would have been produced by their combination. *In re Semaker*. 217 USPQ 1, 5 - 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983). See MPEP 2144.

From the combined teaching of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 8-11, 13 and 14 are included because it would be conventional and within the skill of the art to : (i) determine the proper pore size for the permselective membrane or (ii) to determine the optimum dosage and means of administration of insulin-secreting cells in an absent of a showing of unobvious property. Moreover, Applicant acknowledge that one of ordinary skill in the art can readily determine the proper pore size for the permselective membrane ( see page 8, line 13-20 of the instant Specification in particular). Further, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges or means of administration involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 220 F2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233; 235 (CCPA 1955). see MPEP § 2144.05 part II A.

4. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,703,017 or by US Patent 5,425764 or US Patent 5,629,194 each in view Posselt et al (Diabetes, 1992, v.41, pages 771-775) as applied to claims 1-4 and 6-14 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,529,914 for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, mailed on 06/16/05

Applicant's arguments, filed 08/19/05 have been fully considered, but have not been found convincing .

Applicant asserts that because US Patent 6,703,017, US Patent 5,425764 US Patent 5,629,194 and Posselt et al., are not prior art and do not suggest the claimed invention they can not be used in combination with US Patent 5,529,914.

As have been discussed, supra, it is the Examiner position that the prior art of US Patent 6,703,017, US Patent 5,425764 US Patent 5,629,194 and Posselt et al., do suggest the claimed invention and thus can be used in combination with US Patent 5,529,914.

The combined references do not explicitly teach a method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising implanting insulin-secreting cells, wherein insulin-secreting cells are encapsulated in a biologically compatible membrane wherein said membrane comprises polyethylene glycol (PEG).

US Patent '914 teaches a new type of biocompatible membrane as a covering to encapsulate biological materials, comprising PEG that is acceptable for implants in mammalian. ( see entire document, Abstract in particular). US Patent '914 teaches that various types of cells can be encapsulated in said biocompatible membrane and that said encapsulation will prevent rejection of encapsulated cells during transplantation ( see column 10 in particular).

Art Unit: 1644

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of US Patent '914 to those of US Patent " 017, US Patent ' 764 , US Patent' 194 and Posselt et al., to obtain a claimed method of treating diabetes in a mammal comprising implanting insulin-secreting cells, wherein insulin-secreting cells are encapsulated in a biologically compatible membrane wherein said membrane comprises polyethylene glycol (PEG).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so, because encapsulation of cells in biologically compatible membrane comprising PEG will prevent rejection of encapsulated cells during transplantation as taught by US Patent '914. Said type of biocompatible membrane can be used to substitute the different type of biocompatible membrane for successful implantation of insulin-producing cells in the method of treating diabetes taught by combined references of US Patent " 017, US Patent ' 764 , US Patent' 194 and Posselt et al. The strongest rationale for combining references is a recognition, expressly or impliedly in the prior art or drawn from a convincing line of reasoning based on established scientific principles or legal precedent, that some advantage or expected beneficial result would have been produced by their combination. *In re Semaker.* 217 USPQ 1, 5 - 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983). See MPEP 2144..

From the combined teaching of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

5. No claim is allowed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michail Belyavskyi whose telephone number is 571/272-0840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571/272-0841.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571/273-8300

Art Unit: 1644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michail Belyavskyi, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
October 28, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MICHAIL BELYAVSKYI".